

Review

Pteridophyta of Peru, Part IV, 17. Dryopteridaceae, by Rolla M. Tryon and Robert G. Stolze. 1991. *Fieldiana Bot.*, n. s. 27:1–176.

This treatment accounts for the ferns found in Peru that belong to the Dryopteridaceae *sensu lato*, including those commonly placed in the Woodsiaceae and Lomariopsidaceae. John T. Mickel contributed *Peltapteris* and the large and difficult genus *Elaphoglossum* (including 121 species, 52 of them new), and Robbin C. Moran contributed *Olfersia*, *Polybotrya*, and *Stigmatopteris*.

The format continues that established in the earlier parts: each genus has a synonymy, description, and key to species. Each species has a brief synonymy concentrating on names from Peru and nearby Andean countries, a description, statements of habitat and range, notes, and some specimens cited. One to a few species per genus are illustrated. The illustrations are, as in the *Ferns and Fern Allies of Guatemala* produced by R. G. Stolze, treasures of botanical art, as well as being informative. (Alas, I didn't find any of the minute but greatly diverting birds that graced some of the illustrations in that work.)

I must disagree with one statement made in the Introduction, where Morton's careful research in dating the parts of Sodiro's *Cryptogamae Vasculares Quitenses* (*Amer. Fern J.* 62:57–62. 1972) is dismissed. Tryon and Stolze argue for publication of the entire book in 1893, based entirely on a casual comment made a quarter century later by Mille (*Revista Col. Nac. Vicente Rocafuerte* 9(27/29):191. [Nov. Rec. Crypt. Vasc. Ecuad. 1] 1927): "... en 1883 publicaba el R. P. Luis Sodiro ... su *Recensio Cryptogamarum Vascularium provinciae quitensis* ... y 10 años más tarde daba ... su gran obra de *Cryptogamae Vasculares quitenses*..." Although Mille may have been in a position to know, he is not mentioned in the introduction to Sodiro's book, as two other Ecuadorian collectors were, and he was only 20 years old at the time. It is more likely that Mille just quoted the title page date in providing background information for his own *Nova Recensio*. ... On the other hand, Morton (1972, p. 58) proved by internal evidence found within Sodiro's book itself that certain parts of the book were not published until after 1893. Therefore, Morton's dating of the parts as original publication between 1892 and 1895 should be used until his evidence is conclusively refuted. Stafleu and Cowan (*Tax. Lit. ed.* 2, 5:715. 1985) also drew the incorrect conclusion that the title-page date of 1893 takes precedence over parts originally published later, a proposition also refuted by Morton.—DAVID B. LELLINGER, Dept. of Botany NHB-166, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560.